

Commutativity conditions on derivations and Lie ideals in σ -prime rings

L. Oukhtite, S. Salhi & L. Taoufiq

Université Moulay Ismaïl, Faculté des Sciences et Techniques

Département de Mathématiques, Groupe d'Algèbre et Applications

B. P. 509 Boutalamine, Errachidia; Maroc

oukhtitel@hotmail.com, salhi@fastmail.fm, lahcentaoufiq@yahoo.com

Abstract

Let R be a 2-torsion free σ -prime ring, U a nonzero square closed σ -Lie ideal of R and let d be a derivation of R . In this paper it is shown that:

- 1) If d is centralizing on U , then $d = 0$ or $U \subseteq Z(R)$.
- 2) If either $d([x, y]) = 0$ for all $x, y \in U$, or $[d(x), d(y)] = 0$ for all $x, y \in U$ and d commutes with σ on U , then $d = 0$ or $U \subseteq Z(R)$.

2000 Mathematics Subject Classification: 16W10, 16W25, 16U80.

Key words and phrases: σ -prime ring, derivation, commutativity.

1 Introduction

Throughout this paper, R will represent an associative ring with center $Z(R)$. Recall that R is said to be 2-torsion free if whenever $2x = 0$, with $x \in R$, then $x = 0$. R is prime if $aRb = 0$ implies that $a = 0$ or $b = 0$ for all a and b in R . If σ is an involution in R , then R is said to be σ -prime if $aRb = aR\sigma(b) = 0$ implies that $a = 0$ or $b = 0$. It is obvious that every prime ring equipped with an involution σ is also σ -prime, but the converse need not be true in general. An additive mapping $d : R \rightarrow R$ is said to be a derivation if $d(xy) = d(x)y + xd(y)$ for all x, y in R . A mapping $F : R \rightarrow R$ is said to be centralizing on a subset S of R if $[F(s), s] \in Z(R)$ for all $s \in S$. In particular, if $[F(s), s] = 0$ for all $s \in S$, then F is commuting on S . In all that follows $Sa_\sigma(R)$ will denote the set of symmetric and skew-symmetric elements of R ; i.e., $Sa_\sigma(R) = \{x \in R / \sigma(x) = \pm x\}$. For any $x, y \in R$, the commutator $xy - yx$ will be denoted by $[x, y]$. An additive subgroup U of R is said to be a Lie ideal of R if $[u, r] \in U$ for all $u \in U$ and $r \in R$. A Lie ideal U which satisfies $\sigma(U) \subseteq U$ is called a σ -Lie ideal. If U is a Lie (resp. σ -Lie) ideal of R , then U is called a square closed Lie (resp. σ -Lie) ideal if $u^2 \in U$ for

all $u \in U$. Since $(u + v)^2 \in U$ and $[u, v] \in U$, we see that $2uv \in U$ for all $u, v \in U$. Therefore, for all $r \in R$ we get $2r[u, v] = 2[u, rv] - 2[u, r]v \in U$ and $2[u, v]r = 2[u, vr] - 2v[u, r] \in U$, so that $2R[U, U] \subseteq U$ and $2[U, U]R \subseteq U$. This remark will be freely used in the whole paper.

Many works concerning the relationship between commutativity of a ring and the behavior of derivations defined on this ring have been studied. The first important result in this subject is Posner's Theorem, which states that the existence of a nonzero centralizing derivation on a prime ring forces this ring to be commutative ([9]). This result has been generalized by many authors in several ways.

In [3], I. N. Herstein proved that if R is a prime ring of characteristic not 2 which has a nonzero derivation d such that $[d(x), d(y)] = 0$ for all $x, y \in R$, then R is commutative. Motivated by this result, H. E. Bell, in [1], studied derivations d satisfying $d([x, y]) = 0$ for all $x, y \in R$. In [4] and [7], L. Oukhtite and S. Salhi generalized these results to σ -prime rings. In particular, they proved that if R is a 2-torsion free σ -prime ring equipped with a nonzero derivation which is centralizing on R , then R is necessarily commutative.

Our purpose in this paper is to extend these results to square closed σ -Lie ideals.

2 Preliminaries and results

In order to prove our main theorems, we shall need the following lemmas.

Lemma 1 ([8], Lemma 4) If $U \not\subseteq Z(R)$ is a σ -Lie ideal of a 2-torsion free σ -prime ring R and $a, b \in R$ such that $aUb = \sigma(a)Ub = 0$ or $aUb = aU\sigma(b) = 0$, then $a = 0$ or $b = 0$.

Lemma 2 ([5], Lemma 2.3) Let $0 \neq U$ be a σ -Lie ideal of a 2-torsion free σ -prime ring R . If $[U, U] = 0$, then $U \subseteq Z(R)$.

Lemma 3 ([6], Lemma 2.2) Let R be a 2-torsion free σ -prime ring and U a nonzero σ -Lie ideal of R . If d is a derivation of R which commutes with σ and satisfies $d(U) = 0$, then either $d = 0$ or $U \subseteq Z(R)$.

Remark. One can easily verify that Lemma 3 is still valid if the condition that d commutes with σ is replaced by $d \circ \sigma = -\sigma \circ d$.

Theorem 1 Let R be a 2-torsion free σ -prime ring and U a square closed σ -Lie ideal of R . If d is a derivation of R satisfying $[d(u), u] \in Z(R)$ for all $u \in U$, then $U \subseteq Z(R)$ or $d = 0$.

Proof. Suppose that $U \not\subseteq Z(R)$. As $[d(x), x] \in Z(R)$ for all $x \in U$, by linearization $[d(x), y] + [d(y), x] \in Z(R)$ for all $x, y \in U$. Since $\text{char} R \neq 2$, the fact that $[d(x), x^2] + [d(x^2), x] \in Z(R)$ yields $x[d(x), x] \in Z(R)$ for all $x \in U$; hence

$$[r, x][d(x), x] = 0 \quad \text{for all } x \in U, r \in R,$$

and therefore $[d(x), x]^2 = 0$ for all $x \in U$. Since $[d(x), x] \in Z(R)$,

$$[d(x), x]R[d(x), x]\sigma([d(x), x]) = 0 \quad \text{for all } x \in U$$

and the σ -primeness of R yields $[d(x), x] = 0$ or $[d(x), x]\sigma([d(x), x]) = 0$. If $[d(x), x]\sigma([d(x), x]) = 0$, then $[d(x), x]R\sigma([d(x), x]) = 0$; and the fact that $[d(x), x]^2 = 0$ gives

$$[d(x), x]R\sigma([d(x), x]) = [d(x), x]R[d(x), x] = 0.$$

Since R is σ -prime, we obtain

$$[d(x), x] = 0 \quad \text{for all } x \in U.$$

Let us consider the map $\delta : R \rightarrow R$ defined by $\delta(x) = d(x) + \sigma \circ d \circ \sigma(x)$. One can easily verify that δ is a derivation of R which commutes with σ and satisfies

$$[\delta(x), x] = 0 \quad \text{for all } x \in U.$$

Linearizing this equality, we obtain

$$[\delta(x), y] + [\delta(y), x] = 0 \quad \text{for all } x, y \in U.$$

Writing $2xz$ instead of y and using $\text{char} R \neq 2$, we find that

$$\delta(x)[x, z] = 0 \quad \text{for all } x, z \in U.$$

Replacing z by $2zy$ in this equality, we conclude that $\delta(x)z[x, y] = 0$, so that

$$\delta(x)U[x, y] = 0 \quad \text{for all } x, y \in U. \tag{1}$$

By virtue of Lemma 1, it then follows that

$$\delta(x) = 0 \quad \text{or} \quad [x, U] = 0, \quad \text{for all } x \in U \cap Sa_\sigma(R).$$

Let $u \in U$. Since $u - \sigma(u) \in U \cap Sa_\sigma(R)$, it follows that

$$\delta(u - \sigma(u)) = 0 \quad \text{or} \quad [u - \sigma(u), U] = 0.$$

If $\delta(u - \sigma(u)) = 0$, then $\delta(u) \in Sa_\sigma(R)$ and (1) yields $\delta(u) = 0$ or $[u, U] = 0$.
If $[u - \sigma(u), U] = 0$, then $[u, y] = [\sigma(u), y]$ for all $y \in U$ and (1) assures that

$$\delta(u)U[u, y] = 0 = \delta(u)U\sigma([u, y]), \text{ for all } y \in U.$$

Applying Lemma 1, we find that $\delta(u) = 0$ or $[u, U] = 0$. Hence, U is a union of two additive subgroups G_1 and G_2 , where

$$G_1 = \{u \in U \text{ such that } \delta(u) = 0\} \text{ and } G_2 = \{u \in U \text{ such that } [u, U] = 0\}.$$

Since a group cannot be a union of two of its proper subgroups, we are forced to $U = G_1$ or $U = G_2$. Since $U \not\subseteq Z(R)$, Lemma 2 assures that $U = G_1$ and therefore $\delta(U) = 0$. Now applying Lemma 3, we get $\delta = 0$ and therefore $d \circ \sigma = -\sigma \circ d$. As $[d(x), x] = 0$ for all $x \in U$, in view of the above Remark, similar reasoning leads to $d = 0$. ■

Corollary 1 ([7], Theorem 1.1) Let R be a 2-torsion free σ -prime ring and d a nonzero derivation of R . If d is centralizing on R , then R is commutative.

Theorem 2 Let U be a square closed σ -Lie ideal of a 2-torsion free σ -prime ring R and d a derivation of R which commutes with σ on U .
If $[d(x), d(y)] = d([y, x])$ for all $x, y \in U$, then $d = 0$ or $U \subseteq Z(R)$.

Proof. Suppose that $U \not\subseteq Z(R)$. We have

$$[d(x), d(y)] = d([y, x]) \text{ for all } x, y \in U. \quad (2)$$

Substituting $2xy$ for y in (2) and using $\text{char} R \neq 2$, we get

$$d(x)[y, x] = [d(x), x]d(y) + d(x)[d(x), y] \text{ for all } x, y \in U. \quad (3)$$

Replacing y by $2[y, z]x$ and using (3), we find that

$$[d(x), x][y, z]d(x) + d(x)[y, z][d(x), x] = 0 \text{ for all } x, y, z \in U. \quad (4)$$

Replace y by $2[y, z]d(x)$ in (3) to get

$$d(x)[y, z][d(x), x] - [d(x), x][y, z]d^2(x) = 0 \text{ for all } x, y, z \in U. \quad (5)$$

From (4) and (5) we obtain

$$[d(x), x][y, z](d(x) + d^2(x)) = 0 \text{ for all } x, y, z \in U. \quad (6)$$

Writing $2[u, v](d(x) + d^2(x))y$ instead of y in (6), where $u, v \in U$, we obtain $[d(x), x][u, v]z(d(x) + d^2(x))y(d(x) + d^2(x)) = 0$, so that

$$[d(x), x][u, v]z(d(x) + d^2(x))U(d(x) + d^2(x)) = 0 \text{ for all } x, u, v, z \in U. \quad (7)$$

If $x \in U \cap Sa_\sigma(R)$, then Lemma 1 together with (7) assures that

$$d(x) + d^2(x) = 0 \text{ or } [d(x), x][u, v]z(d(x) + d^2(x)) = 0 \text{ for all } u, v, z \in U.$$

Suppose that $[d(x), x][u, v]z(d(x) + d^2(x)) = 0$. Then

$$[d(x), x][u, v]U(d(x) + d^2(x)) = 0. \quad (8)$$

Since d commutes with σ and $x \in Sa_\sigma(R)$, in view of (8), Lemma 1 gives

$$d(x) + d^2(x) = 0 \text{ or } [d(x), x][u, v] = 0 \text{ for all } u, v \in U. \quad (9)$$

If $[d(x), x][u, v] = 0$, then replacing u by $2uw$ in (9) where $w \in U$, we obtain

$$[d(x), x]U[u, v] = 0. \quad (10)$$

As $\sigma(U) = U$ and $[U, U] \neq 0$, by (10), Lemma 2 yields that $[d(x), x] = 0$. Thus, in any event,

$$\text{either } [d(x), x] = 0 \text{ or } d(x) + d^2(x) = 0 \text{ for all } x \in U \cap Sa_\sigma(R).$$

Let $x \in U$. Since $x + \sigma(x) \in U \cap Sa_\sigma(R)$, either $d(x + \sigma(x)) + d^2(x + \sigma(x)) = 0$ or $[d(x + \sigma(x)), x + \sigma(x)] = 0$.

If $d(x + \sigma(x)) + d^2(x + \sigma(x)) = 0$, then $d(x) + d^2(x) \in Sa_\sigma(R)$ and (7) yields that $d(x) + d^2(x) = 0$ or $[d(x), x][u, v]U(d(x) + d^2(x)) = 0$.

If $[d(x), x][u, v]U(d(x) + d^2(x)) = 0$, once again using $d(x) + d^2(x) \in Sa_\sigma(R)$, we find that $d(x) + d^2(x) = 0$, or $[d(x), x][u, v] = 0$ for all $u, v \in U$, in which case $[d(x), x] = 0$.

Now suppose that $[d(x + \sigma(x)), x + \sigma(x)] = 0$. As $x - \sigma(x) \in U \cap Sa_\sigma(R)$ we have to distinguish two cases:

- 1) If $d(x - \sigma(x)) + d^2(x - \sigma(x)) = 0$, then $d(x) + d^2(x) \in Sa_\sigma(R)$. Reasoning as above we get $d(x) + d^2(x) = 0$ or $[d(x), x] = 0$.
- 2) If $[d(x - \sigma(x)), x - \sigma(x)] = 0$, then $[d(x), x] \in Sa_\sigma(R)$. Replace u by $2yu$ in (7), with $y \in U$, to get $[d(x), x]y[u, v]z(d(x) + d^2(x))U(d(x) + d^2(x)) = 0$, so that

$$[d(x), x]U[u, v]z(d(x) + d^2(x))U(d(x) + d^2(x)) = 0 \text{ for all } x, u, v, z \in U. \quad (11)$$

Since $[d(x), x] \in Sa_\sigma(R)$, from (11) it follows that

$$[d(x), x] = 0 \text{ or } [u, v]U(d(x) + d^2(x))U(d(x) + d^2(x)) = 0 \text{ for all } u, v \in U.$$

Suppose $[u, v]U(d(x) + d^2(x))U(d(x) + d^2(x)) = 0$. As $\sigma(U) = U$ and $[U, U] \neq 0$, then

$$(d(x) + d^2(x))U(d(x) + d^2(x)) = 0. \quad (12)$$

In (6), write $2[u, v](d(x) + d^2(x))r$ instead of z , where $u, v \in U$ and $r \in R$, to obtain

$$[d(x), x][u, v]y(d(x) + d^2(x))r(d(x) + d^2(x)) = 0, \text{ for all } u, v, y \in U, r \in R. \quad (13)$$

Replacing r by $r\sigma(d(x) + d^2(x))z$ in (13), where $z \in U$, we find that

$$[d(x), x][u, v]y(d(x) + d^2(x))r\sigma(d(x) + d^2(x))z(d(x) + d^2(x)) = 0,$$

which leads us to

$$[d(x), x][u, v]y(d(x) + d^2(x))U\sigma(d(x) + d^2(x))U(d(x) + d^2(x)) = 0. \quad (14)$$

Since $\sigma(d(x) + d^2(x))U(d(x) + d^2(x))$ is invariant under σ , by virtue of (14), Lemma 1 yields

$$\sigma(d(x) + d^2(x))U(d(x) + d^2(x)) = 0 \text{ or } [d(x), x][u, v]y(d(x) + d^2(x)) = 0.$$

If $\sigma(d(x) + d^2(x))U(d(x) + d^2(x)) = 0$, then (12) implies that $d(x) + d^2(x) = 0$. Now assume that

$$[d(x), x][u, v]y(d(x) + d^2(x)) = 0 \text{ for all } u, v, y \in U. \quad (15)$$

Replace v by $2wv$ in (15), where $w \in U$, and use (15) to get

$$[d(x), x]w[u, v]y(d(x) + d^2(x)) = 0,$$

so that

$$[d(x), x]U[u, v]y(d(x) + d^2(x)) = 0 \text{ for all } u, v, y \in U. \quad (16)$$

As $[d(x), x] \in Sa_\sigma(R)$, (16) yields $[u, v]U(d(x) + d^2(x)) = 0$, in which case $d(x) + d^2(x) = 0$, or $[d(x), x] = 0$.

In conclusion, for all $x \in U$ we have either $[d(x), x] = 0$ or $d(x) + d^2(x) = 0$.

Now let $x \in U$ such that $d(x) + d^2(x) = 0$. In (2), put $y = 2[y, z]d(x)$ to get

$$d([y, z])[d(x), x] - [[y, z], x]d(x) + [d(x), [y, z]]d(x) = [y, z][d(x), x]. \quad (17)$$

If in (2) we put $y = 2[y, z]x$, we get

$$[[y, z], x]d(x) = [d(x), [y, z]]d(x) + d([y, z])[d(x), x] = 0. \quad (18)$$

From (17) and (18) it then follows that

$$[y, z][d(x), x] = 0 \text{ for all } y, z \in U,$$

hence $[y, z]U[d(x), x] = 0$ for all $y, z \in U$. Applying Lemma 1, this leads to

$$[d(x), x] = 0, \text{ for all } x \in U.$$

By virtue of Theorem 1, this yields that $d = 0$. ■

Note that if d is a derivation of R which acts as an anti-homomorphism on U , then d satisfies the condition $[d(x), d(y)] = d([y, x])$ for all $x, y \in U$. Thus we have the following corollary.

Corollary 2 ([6], Theorem 1.1) Let d be a derivation of a 2-torsion free σ -prime ring R which acts as an anti-homomorphism on a nonzero square closed σ -Lie ideal U of R . If d commutes with σ , then either $d = 0$ or $U \subseteq Z(R)$.

Theorem 3 Let U be a square closed σ -Lie ideal of a 2-torsion free σ -prime ring R and d a derivation of R . If either $d([x, y]) = 0$ for all $x, y \in U$, or $[d(x), d(y)] = 0$ for all $x, y \in U$ and d commutes with σ on U , then $d = 0$ or $U \subseteq Z(R)$.

Proof. Suppose that $U \not\subseteq Z(R)$. Assume that $d([x, y]) = 0$ for all $x, y \in U$. Let δ be the derivation of R defined by $\delta(x) = d(x) + \sigma \circ d \circ \sigma(x)$. Clearly, δ commutes with σ and $\delta([x, y]) = 0$ for all $x, y \in U$, so that

$$[\delta(x), y] = [\delta(y), x] \text{ for all } x, y \in U. \quad (19)$$

Writing $[x, y]$ instead of y in (19), we find that

$$[\delta(x), [x, y]] = 0 \text{ for all } x, y \in U. \quad (20)$$

Replacing x by x^2 in (19), we conclude that

$$\delta(x)[x, y] + [x, y]\delta(x) = 0 \text{ for all } x, y \in U. \quad (21)$$

As $\text{char} R \neq 2$, from (20) and (21) it follows that

$$\delta(x)[x, y] = 0 \text{ for all } x, y \in U. \quad (22)$$

Replacing y by $2zy$ in (22), we get $\delta(x)z[x, y] = 0$, so that

$$\delta(x)U[x, y] = 0 \text{ for all } x, y \in U.$$

From the proof of Theorem 1, we conclude that $\delta = 0$ and thus $d \circ \sigma = -\sigma \circ d$. Since d satisfies $d([x, y]) = 0$ for all $x, y \in U$, by similar reasoning, we are forced to $d = 0$.

Now assume that d commutes with σ and satisfies $[d(x), d(y)] = 0$ for all $x, y \in U$. The fact that $[d(x), d(2xy)] = 0$ implies that

$$d(x)[d(x), y] + [d(x), x]d(y) = 0 \quad \text{for all } x, y \in U. \quad (23)$$

Replace y by $2[y, z]d(u)$ in (23), where $z, u \in U$, to find that

$$[d(x), x][y, z]d^2(u) = 0 \quad \text{for all } x, y, u \in U. \quad (24)$$

Write $2[s, t]d^2(w)y$ instead of y in (24), where $s, t, w \in U$, thereby concluding that $[d(x), x]z[s, t]d^2(w)y d^2(u) = 0$. Accordingly,

$$[d(x), x]z[s, t]d^2(w)Ud^2(u) = 0 \quad \text{for all } s, t, u, w, x \in U. \quad (25)$$

Since d commutes with σ and $\sigma(U) = U$, using (25) we find that

$$d^2(U) = 0 \quad \text{or} \quad [d(x), x]U[s, t]d^2(w) = 0.$$

Suppose that

$$[d(x), x]U[s, t]d^2(w) = 0 \quad \text{for all } s, t, w, x \in U. \quad (26)$$

Replacing t by $2tv$ in (26), where $v \in U$, we are forced to

$$[d(x), x][s, t]vd^2(w) = 0$$

and hence

$$[d(x), x][s, t]Ud^2(w) = 0 \quad \text{for all } s, t, w, x \in U. \quad (27)$$

Since $\sigma(U) = U$ and d commutes with σ , then (27) implies that either $d^2(U) = 0$, or $[d(x), x][s, t] = 0$ for all $s, t, x \in U$, in which case $[d(x), x] = 0$ for all $x \in U$. Thus, in any event, we find that

$$d^2(U) = 0 \quad \text{or} \quad [d(x), x] = 0 \quad \text{for all } x \in U.$$

If $d^2(U) = 0$, then [[5], Theorem 1.1] assures that $d = 0$.

If $[d(x), x] = 0$ for all $x \in U$, then Theorem 1 yields $d = 0$. ■

Corollary 3 ([4], Theorem 3.3) Let d be a nonzero derivation of a 2-torsion free σ -prime ring R . If $d([x, y]) = 0$ for all $x, y \in R$, then R is commutative.

References

- [1] H. E. Bell, M. N. Daif, *On derivations and commutativity in prime rings*, Acta. Math. Hungar. 66 (1995), 337-343.
- [2] M. Brešar, *Centralizing mappings and derivations in prime rings*, J. Algebra. 156 (1993), 385-394.
- [3] I. N. Herstein, *Rings with involution*, Univ. Chicago Press. Chicago 1976.
- [4] L. Oukhtite, S. Salhi, *On commutativity of σ -prime rings*, Glas. Mat. Ser. III. 41 (2006), no. 1, 57-64.
- [5] L. Oukhtite, S. Salhi, *Lie ideals and derivations of σ -prime rings*, Int. J. Algebra 1 (2007), no. 1, 25-30.
- [6] L. Oukhtite, S. Salhi, *σ -Lie ideals with derivations as homomorphisms and anti-homomorphisms*, Int. J. Algebra 1 (2007), no. 5, 235-239.
- [7] L. Oukhtite, S. Salhi, *On derivations in σ -prime rings*, Int. J. Algebra 1 (2007), no. 5, 241-246.
- [8] L. Oukhtite, S. Salhi, *Centralizing automorphisms and Jordan left derivations on σ -prime rings*, Advances in Algebra, to appear.
- [9] E. C. Posner, *Derivations in prime rings*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 8 (1957), 1093-1100.
- [10] J. Vukman, *Commuting and centralizing mappings in prime rings*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 109 (1990), 47-52.